

HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

SILVER VALLEY PARTNERS, LLC, et al,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RAY DE MOTTE, et al,

Defendants.

Case No. CV05-5590 RBL

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION TO UNSEAL AND  
GRANTING MOTION TO EXTEND  
SCHEDULING ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs' Motion to Unseal Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, [Dkt. #100], and Plaintiffs' Motion to Extend the Scheduling Order. [Dkt. #117]. Defendants oppose the Motion to Unseal arguing that the information contained in the First Amended Complaint discloses private and proprietary information that should remain confidential.

The purpose of the Protective Order is to keep as confidential "any material that contains information that . . . constitutes legitimately confidential, proprietary, private, or similarly protected information." [Dkt. #100, 2:11-13]. As Defendants and Plaintiffs agree, the document in dispute for this motion, the First Amended Complaint, does contain information derived from banking and financial records. Although these records are and should remain confidential, the general allegations in the First Amended Complaint based on a review of these records do not include information detailed or specific enough to require it be kept confidential. Therefore, the document does not fall under the protection of the Court's Protective Order and is not required to be under seal.

Protective Orders are narrowly drawn in order to preserve the open nature of litigation. This is a public

1 court and its business should be conducted publicly unless the information in dispute clearly falls within the  
2 narrow confines of the Court's Protective Order. Plaintiffs' Motion to Unseal the First Amended Complaint  
3 is GRANTED.

4 Both Plaintiffs and Defendants agree that all parties will benefit from an amended case order, although  
5 Plaintiffs ask for a ninety day extension of existing deadlines and Defendants request the Court issue a new  
6 scheduling order setting the trial date for one year-and-a-half after the date the First Amended Complaint was  
7 filed. The Court finds ninety days sufficient to give newly joined Defendants adequate time to prepare their  
8 defense. Plaintiffs' Motion [Dkt. #117] for a ninety day extension of existing deadlines is GRANTED.

9  
10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 DATED this 24<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2006

12   
13 RONALD B. LEIGHTON  
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28